

DISCUSSION OF THE AMENDMENT

Claims 1 and 3, 8 and 12-17 have been canceled.

New Claims 20-27 have been added as supported by Claims 1, 3, 8, and 13-17 as originally filed. New Claim 28 is supported at page 17, lines 17.

No new matter is believed to have been added by the above amendment. Claims 6, 7, 9-11 and 18-28 are now pending in the application.

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application, as amended, in view of the following remarks.

The present invention as set forth in **amended Claim 6** relates to a film-laminated flat conductor, comprising:

thermoplastic polyurethane films; and

at least one metal strip between said films.

Ambrose, Shukushima and Nishiguchi et al, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the combination of metal strips and TPU films in film-laminated flat conductors.

Ambrose uses printed conductor tracks (column 2 lines 51 to 57), using a **conductive ink**, which consists, for example, of a **polymeric material**, which must be cured (column 12 line 52 to column 13 line 5).

The advantages of a metal ribbon as conductor are easier processability and higher conductivity as well as lower costs. However, metal ions catalyze the decomposition of polymers (page 6 lines 22 to 24). As discussed in Shukushima, the metal surface in contact with the thermoplastic polyurethane is very much larger in film-type flat conductors in particular than in conventional cables, because of the use of metal ribbons instead of wires. Furthermore, the thickness of the enveloping films of insulating material containing TPU is only very thin, preferably only between 25 and 250 micrometers (page 17 lines 15 to 19). See also new Claim 28. It is therefore not obvious, but instead it is surprising, that it is possible to manufacture and use film-type flat-conductors containing a metal ribbon and TPU. Ambrose, Shukushima and Nishiguchi et al, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest the combination of metal strips and TPU films in film-laminated flat conductors, in fact they teach away from such combination.

Therefore, the rejections of Claims 6-17 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Ambrose, Shukushima and Nishiguchi et al are believed to be unsustainable as the present invention is neither anticipated nor obvious and withdrawal of these rejections is respectfully requested.

This application presents allowable subject matter, and the Examiner is kindly requested to pass it to issue. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding the claims or otherwise wish to discuss this case, he is kindly invited to contact Applicants' below-signed representative, who would be happy to provide any assistance deemed necessary in speeding this application to allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.
Norman F. Oblon



Kirsten A. Grueneberg, Ph.D.
Registration No.: 47,297

Customer Number
22850